Fully Distributed Adaptive Controllers for Cooperative Output Regulation of Heterogeneous Linear Multi-agent Systems with Directed Graphs

Zhongkui Li, Michael Z.Q. Chen, and Zhengtao Ding

arXiv:1411.7125v3 [math.OC] 23 Jan 2015

***Abstract*—This paper considers the cooperative output regulation problem for linear multi-agent systems with a directed communication graph, heterogeneous linear subsystems, and an exosystem whose output is available to only a subset of subsystems. Both the cases with nominal and uncertain linear subsystems are studied. For the case with nominal linear subsystems, a distributed adaptive observer-based controller is designed, where the distributed adaptive observer is implemented for the subsystems to estimate the exogenous signal. For the case with uncertain linear subsystems, the proposed distributed observer and the internal model principle are combined to solve the robust cooperative output regulation problem. Compared with the existing works, one main contribution of this paper is that the proposed control schemes can be designed and implemented by each subsystem in a fully distributed fashion for general directed graphs. For the special case with undirected graphs, a distributed output feedback control law is further presented.**

***Index Terms*—networked control systems, cooperative control, output regulation, consensus, directed graph.**

I. Introduction

Cooperative output regulation of multi-agent systems is to have a group of autonomous agents (subsystems) interacting with each other via communication or sensing to asymptotically track a prescribed trajectory and/or maintain asymptotic rejection of disturbances. The cooperative output regulation problem is closely related to the consensus problem and other cooperative control problems as studied in [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8] and the references therein. Actually, the cooperative output regulation problem contains the leader-follower consensus or distributed tracking problem as special cases. A central work in cooperative output regulation is to design appropriate distributed controllers, depending on only the local state or output information of each agent and its neighbors. Considering the flexibility and reconfigurability that multi-agent systems are expected to maintain and meanwhile the limited sensing or communicating capacity that the agents have, distributed control schemes, compared with centralized ones, are believed to be more favorable.

In the recent years, the cooperative output regulation problem has been extensively investigated by many researchers. Many interesting results are reported, e.g., in [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19]. In particular, several state and output feedback control laws are proposed in [9], [10], [11], [12] to achieve cooperative output regulation for multi-agent systems with heterogeneous but known linear subsystems. The robust cooperative output regulation problem of uncertain linear multi-agent systems is studied in [13], [14], [15], where internal-model-based controllers are designed. In [16], [17], [18], [19], cooperative global output regulation is discussed for several classes of nonlinear multi-agent systems.

Although many advances have been reported on the cooperative output regulation problem, some challenging issues remain unresolved. For instance, control design presented in [10], [13], [14], [15] explicitly depends on certain nonzero eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix associated with the communication graph. However, it is worth mentioning that any nonzero eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix is global information of the communication graph. Using these global information of the communication graph prevents fully distributed implementation of the controllers. In other words, the controllers given in the aforementioned papers are not fully distributed. In [11], fully distributed adaptive controllers are proposed, which implement adaptive laws to update the time-varying coupling weights between neighboring agents. Similar adaptive protocols have been also presented in [20], [21], [22], [23] to solve the leaderless and leader-follower consensus problems. It is worth noting that the adaptive controllers in [11] are applicable to only the case where the graph among the agents are undirected and that the adaptive protocols in [20], [21], [22], [23] are designed for homogeneous multi-agent systems. To design fully distributed controllers to achieve cooperative output regulation for heterogeneous multi-agent systems with general directed graphs is much more challenging, due to both the heterogeneity of the agents and the asymmetry of the directed graphs, and is still open, to the best knowledge of the authors.

This paper extends the fully distributed control design to the cooperative output regulation problem for linear multi-agent systems with a general directed communication graph, heterogeneous linear subsystems, and an exosystem whose output is available to only a subset of subsystems. Both the cases with nominal and uncertain linear subsystems are studied. A

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grants 61473005 and 11332001, and a Foundation for the Author of National Excellent Doctoral Dissertation of PR China.

Z. Li is with the State Key Laboratory for Turbulence and Complex Systems, Department of Mechanics and Engineering Science, College of Engineering, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China (E-mail: zhongkli@pku.edu.cn).

M.Z.Q. Chen is with the Department of Mechanical Engineering, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong (E-mail: mzqchen@hku.hk).

Z. Ding is with the Control Systems Centre, School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, University of Manchester, Sackville Street Building, Manchester M13 9PL, UK (E-mail: zhengtao.ding@manchester.ac.uk).

distributed adaptive observer-based controller is designed to solve the cooperative output regulation problem for multi-agent systems with nominal linear subsystems. The distributed adaptive observer, which utilizes the observer states from neighboring subsystems, is constructed for the subsystems to asymptotically estimate the exogenous signal. The case with uncertain linear subsystems is further studied. The proposed distributed adaptive observer and the internal model principle are combined to design distributed controllers to solve the robust cooperative output regulation problem. The proposed control schemes in this paper, in contrast to the controllers in [10], [10], [13], [14], [15], [24], can be designed and implemented by each subsystem in a fully distributed fashion, and, different from those in [11], are applicable to general directed graphs.

In the last part of this paper, a special case with undirected graphs is further discussed. A distributed adaptive output feedback control law is presented for uncertain linear subsystems. The output feedback controller has the advantage of demanding less communication cost. The assumptions are investigated for the existence of the distributed controllers. A simulation example is finally presented to illustrate the effectiveness of the obtained results.

II. Cooperative Output Regulation of Linear Multi-Agent Systems

A. Problem Statement

In this section, we consider a network consisting of N heterogeneous subsystems and an exosystem. The dynamics of the i-th subsystem are described by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= A_i x_i + B_i u_i + E_i v, \\ e_i &= C_i x_i + D_i v, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $x_i \in \mathbf{R}^{n_i}$, $u_i \in \mathbf{R}^{m_i}$, and $e_i \in \mathbf{R}^{p_i}$ are, respectively, the state, the control input, and the regulated output of the i-th subsystem, and A_i, B_i, C_i, and D_i are constant matrices with appropriate dimensions.

In (1), $v \in \mathbf{R}^q$ represents the exogenous signal which can be either a reference input to be tracked or the disturbance to be rejected. The exogenous signal v is generated by the following exosystem:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{v} &= Sv, \\ y_v &= Fv, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $y_v \in \mathbf{R}^l$ is the output of the exosystem, $S \in \mathbf{R}^{q\times q}$, and $F \in \mathbf{R}^{l\times q}$.

To achieve cooperative output regulation, the subsystems need information from other subsystems or the exosystem. The information flow among the N subsystems can be modeled by a directed graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \cdots, v_N\}$ is the node set and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ is the edge set, in which an edge is represented by an ordered pair of distinct nodes. If $(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}$, node v_i is called a neighbor of node v_j. A graph is said to be undirected if $(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}$ implies $(v_j, v_i) \in \mathcal{E}$ for any $v_i, v_j \in \mathcal{V}$. A directed path from node v_{i_1} to node v_{i_l} is a sequence of adjacent edges of the form $(v_{i_k}, v_{i_{k+1}})$, $k = 1, \cdots, l-1$. A directed graph contains a directed spanning tree if there exists a root node that has directed paths to all other nodes.

Since the exosystem (2) does not receive information from any subsystem, it can be viewed as a virtual leader, indexed by 0. The N subsystems in (1) are the followers, indexed by $1, \cdots, N$. It is assumed that the output y_v of the exosystem (2) is available to only a subset of the followers. Without loss of generality, suppose that the subsystems indexed by $1, \cdots, M$ ($1 \le M \ll N$), have direct access to the exosystem (2) and the rest of the followers do not. The followers indexed by $1, \cdots, M$, are called the informed followers and the rest are the uninformed ones. The communication graph $\mathcal{G}$ among the N subsystems is assumed to satisfy the following assumption.

Assumption 1: For each uninformed follower, there exists at least one informed follower that has a directed path to that uninformed follower.

For the case with only one informed follower, Assumption 1 is equivalent to that the graph $\mathcal{G}$ contains a directed spanning tree with the informed follower as the root node.

For the directed graph $\mathcal{G}$, its adjacency matrix $\mathcal{A} = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbf{R}^{N\times N}$ is defined by $a_{ii} = 0$, $a_{ij} = 1$ if $(v_j, v_i) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The Laplacian matrix $\mathcal{L} = [\mathcal{L}_{ij}] \in \mathbf{R}^{N\times N}$ associated with $\mathcal{G}$ is defined as $\mathcal{L}_{ii} = \sum_{j\neq i} a_{ij}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{ij} = -a_{ij}$, $i \neq j$.

Because the informed subsystems indexed by $1, \cdots, M$, can have direct access to the exosystem (2), they do not have to communicate with other subsystems to ensure that e_i, $1, \cdots, M$, converge to zero. To avoid unnecessarily increasing the number of communication channels, we assume that the informed subsystems do not receive information from other subsystems, i.e., they have no neighbors except the exosystem. In this case, the Laplacian matrix $\mathcal{L}$ associated with $\mathcal{G}$ can be partitioned as

$$\mathcal{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{M\times M} & 0_{M\times(N-M)} \\ \mathcal{L}_2 & \mathcal{L}_1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_2 \in \mathbf{R}^{(N-M)\times M}$ and $\mathcal{L}_1 \in \mathbf{R}^{(N-M)\times(N-M)}$. Under Assumption 1, it is known that all the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}_1$ have positive real parts [25]. Moreover, it is easy to verify that $\mathcal{L}_1$ is a nonsingular M-matrix [26], for which we have the following result.

Lemma 1 ([26], [23]): There exists a positive diagonal matrix G such that $G\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_1^T G > 0$. One such G is given by $\mathrm{diag}(q_{M+1}, \cdots, q_N)$, where $q = [q_{M+1}, \cdots, q_N]^T = (\mathcal{L}_1^T)^{-1}\mathbf{1}$.

The objective of the cooperative output regulation problem considered in this section is to design appropriate distributed controllers based on the local information available to the subsystems such that (i) The overall closed-loop system is asymptotically stable when $v = 0$; (ii) For any initial conditions $x_i(0)$, $i = 1, \cdots, N$, and $v(0)$, $\lim_{t\to\infty} e_i(t) = 0$.

Remark 1: By letting $D_i = -F$ in (1) and regarding $C_i x_i$ as the output of the i-th subsystem, the regulated output e_i is equal to $C_i x_i - Fv$. In this case, the cooperative output regulation problem turns out to be the leader-follower output consensus problem as studied in [27], [28].

To solve the above cooperative output regulation problem, the following assumptions are needed.

Assumption 2: The matrix S has no eigenvalues with negative real parts.

Assumption 3: The pairs (A_i, B_i), $i = 1, \cdots, N$, are stabilizable.

Assumption 4: The pair (S, F) is detectable.

Assumption 5: For all $\lambda \in \sigma(S)$, where $\sigma(S)$ denotes the spectrum of S, $\mathrm{rank}\left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix} A_i-\lambda I & B_i \\ C_i & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]\right) = n_i + p_i$.

Remark 2: Assumptions 2–5 are the standard ones required to solve the output regulation problem of a single linear system [29]. Assumption 2 is made only for convenience. The components of the exogenous signal v corresponding to the stable eigenvalues of S exponentially decay to zero and thereby will not affect the asymptotic behavior of the closed-loop system.

B. Distributed Adaptive Controller Design

Since the exogenous signal v is not available to the subsystems for feedback control, the subsystems need to implement some observers to estimate v. For the informed subsystems that have direct access to the output y_v of the exosystem (2), they can estimate v by using the following observers:

$$\dot{\xi}_i = S\xi_i + L(F\xi_i - y_v), \quad i = 1, \cdots, M, \tag{4}$$

where the feedback gain matrix $L \in \mathbf{R}^{p\times l}$ is chosen such that $S + LF$ is Hurwtiz. Denote by $\bar{\xi}_i = \xi_i - v$ the estimation errors. From (2) and (4), it is easy to see that

$$\dot{\bar{\xi}}_i = (S + LF)\bar{\xi}_i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, M, \tag{5}$$

implying that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \bar{\xi}_i(t) = 0$, $i = 1, \cdots, M$.

For the uninformed subsystems that do not have direct access to (2), we need to construct distributed observers to estimate the exogenous signal v. The distributed adaptive observer for each uninformed subsystem is described by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\xi}_i &= S\xi_i - d_i\rho_i \sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij}(\xi_i - \xi_j), \\ d_i &= [\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij}(\xi_i - \xi_j)]^T \Gamma [\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij}(\xi_i - \xi_j)], i = M+1, \cdots, N, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $\xi_i \in \mathbf{R}^p$, $i = M+1, \cdots, N$, denotes the estimate of v on the i-th uninformed subsystem, $d_i(t)$ denotes the time-varying coupling gain associated with the i-th uninformed subsystem with $d_i(0) \geq 1$, a_{ij} is the (i,j)-th entry of the adjacency matrix associated with $\mathcal{G}$, $\Gamma \in \mathbf{R}^{l\times l}$ is the feedback gain matrix, and $\rho_i(\cdot)$ are smooth and monotonically increasing functions in terms of $\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij}(\xi_i - \xi_j)$. The parameters Γ and $\rho_i(\cdot)$ are to be determined.

Since $d_i(0) \geq 1$, it follows from the second equation in (6) that $d_i(t) \geq 1$ for any $t > 0$. By further noting that ρ_i are monotonically increasing functions, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 2 ([23]): For any constants $a, b > 0$ and any function $\varepsilon(t) > 0$,

$$\dot{d}_i b \int_0^{\varepsilon} \rho_i(s)ds \leq \dot{d}_i(\frac{b^3}{3a^2} + \frac{2}{3}a\rho_i^{\frac{3}{2}}\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}).$$

The following theorem designs the observers (4) and (6).

Theorem 1: Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 4 hold. Then, $\lim_{t\to\infty}(\xi_i(t) - v(t)) = 0$, $i = 1, \cdots, N$, if L in (4) is chosen such that $S+LF$ is Hurwtiz and the parameters in the adaptive observer (6) is chosen to be $\Gamma = P^2$ and $\rho_i = (1 + \zeta_i^T P\zeta_i)^3$, $i = M+1, \cdots, N$, where $\zeta_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij}(\xi_i - \xi_j)$ and $P > 0$ is a solution to the following algebraic Riccati equation (ARE):

$$S^T P + PS + I - P^2 = 0. \tag{7}$$

Moreover, the coupling gains d_i in (6) converge to some finite steady-state values.

Proof: Let $\zeta = [\zeta_{M+1}^T, \cdots, \zeta_N^T]^T$. Then, ζ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta &= (\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes I)\begin{bmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \xi_M \end{bmatrix} + (\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes I)\begin{bmatrix} \xi_{M+1} \\ \vdots \\ \xi_N \end{bmatrix} \\ &= (\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes I)\begin{bmatrix} \bar{\xi}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{\xi}_M \end{bmatrix} + (\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes I)\begin{bmatrix} \bar{\xi}_{M+1} \\ \vdots \\ \bar{\xi}_N \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ are defined as in (3), and $\bar{\xi}_i = \xi_i - v$ denote the estimation errors. Because $\mathcal{L}_1$ is nonsingular and $\lim_{t\to\infty} \bar{\xi}_i(t) = 0$, $i = 1, \cdots, M$, it can be observed from (8) that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \bar{\xi}_i(t) = 0$, $i = M+1, \cdots, N$, if and only if $\lim_{t\to\infty} \zeta(t) = 0$. From (6) and (8), it is not difficult to get that ζ and d_i satisfy the following dynamics:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\zeta} &= [I_{N-M} \otimes S - \mathcal{L}_1 \widehat{D}\hat{\rho} \otimes I]\zeta + (\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes LF)\bar{\xi}, \\ \dot{d}_i &= \zeta_i^T \Gamma \zeta_i, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $\hat{\rho} = \mathrm{diag}(\rho_{M+1}, \cdots, \rho_N)$, $\widehat{D} = \mathrm{diag}(d_{M+1}, \cdots, d_N)$, and $\bar{\xi} = [\bar{\xi}_1^T, \cdots, \bar{\xi}_M^T]^T$.

Let

$$V_1 = \sum_{i=M+1}^{N} \frac{d_i q_i}{2} \int_0^{\zeta_i^T P\zeta_i} \rho_i(s)ds + \frac{\hat{\lambda}_0}{48} \sum_{i=M+1}^{N} \tilde{d}_i^2, \tag{10}$$

where $G \triangleq \mathrm{diag}(q_{M+1}, \cdots, q_N) > 0$ is defined as in Lemma 1, $\hat{\lambda}_0$ denotes the smallest eigenvalue of $G\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_1^T G$, and $\tilde{d}_i \triangleq d_i - \alpha$, where α is a positive constant to be determined later.

The time derivative of V_1 along the trajectory of (9) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_1 = &\sum_{i=M+1}^{N} d_i q_i \rho_i \zeta_i^T P\dot{\zeta}_i + \sum_{i=M+1}^{N} \frac{\dot{d}_i q_i}{2} \int_0^{\zeta_i^T P\zeta_i} \rho_i(s)ds \\ &+ \frac{\hat{\lambda}_0}{24} \sum_{i=M+1}^{N} (d_i - \alpha)\zeta_i^T P^2 \zeta_i. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=M+1}^{N} d_i q_i \rho_i \zeta_i^T P\dot{\zeta}_i = \zeta^T(\widehat{D}\hat{\rho}G \otimes P)\dot{\zeta} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\zeta^T[\widehat{D}\hat{\rho}G \otimes (PS + S^T P) - \hat{\lambda}_0 \widehat{D}^2\hat{\rho}^2 \otimes P^2]\zeta \\ &\quad + \zeta^T(\widehat{D}\hat{\rho}G\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes PLF)\bar{\xi}, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where we have used the fact that $G\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_1^T G \geq \hat{\lambda}_0 I$. By using the Young's inequality [30], we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\zeta^T(\widehat{D}\hat{\rho}G\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes PLF)\bar{\xi} \\
&\quad \leq \frac{\hat{\lambda}_0}{24}\|(\widehat{D}\hat{\rho} \otimes P)\zeta\|^2 + \frac{6}{\hat{\lambda}_0}\|(G\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes LF)\bar{\xi}\|^2 \\
&\quad \leq \frac{\hat{\lambda}_0}{24}\|(\widehat{D}\hat{\rho} \otimes P)\zeta\|^2 + \frac{6}{\hat{\lambda}_0}\|G\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes LF\|^2\|\bar{\xi}\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

In light of Lemma 2, we can get that

$$\sum_{i=M+1}^{N} \dot{d}_i q_i \int_0^{\zeta_i^T P \zeta_i} \rho_i(s)ds \leq \sum_{i=M+1}^{N} (\frac{q_i^3}{3\hat{\lambda}_0^2} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{\lambda}_0\rho_i^2)\zeta_i P^2 \zeta_i. \tag{14}$$

Substituting (12), (13), and (14) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V}_1 &\leq \frac{1}{2}\zeta^T[\widehat{D}\hat{\rho}G \otimes (PS + S^T P)]\zeta - \sum_{i=M+1}^{N}[\hat{\lambda}_0(\frac{1}{2}d_i^2\rho_i^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{24}d_i^2\rho_i^2 - \frac{1}{24}d_i - \frac{1}{3}\rho_i^2) + \frac{1}{24}(\hat{\lambda}_0\alpha - \frac{4q_i^3}{\hat{\lambda}_0^2})]\zeta_i^T P^2 \zeta_i \\
&\quad + \frac{6}{\hat{\lambda}_0}\|G\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes LF\|^2\|\bar{\xi}\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\zeta^T[\widehat{D}\hat{\rho}G \otimes (PS + S^T P)]\zeta \\
&\quad - \frac{\hat{\lambda}_0}{12}\sum_{i=M+1}^{N}(d_i^2\rho_i^2 + \hat{\alpha})\zeta_i^T P^2 \zeta_i + \frac{6}{\hat{\lambda}_0}\|G\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes LF\|^2\|\bar{\xi}\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\zeta^T[\widehat{D}\hat{\rho}G \otimes (PS + S^T P - P^2)]\zeta \\
&\quad + \frac{6}{\hat{\lambda}_0}\|G\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes LF\|^2\|\bar{\xi}\|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where we have chosen $\alpha \geq \max \frac{4q_i^3}{\hat{\lambda}_0^3} + 2\hat{\alpha}$ and $\sqrt{\hat{\alpha}} \geq \frac{3}{\hat{\lambda}_0}\max q_i$ to get the last two inequalities.

Let

$$V_2 = \bar{\xi}^T(I_M \otimes \bar{Q})\bar{\xi}, \tag{16}$$

where $\bar{Q} > 0$ satisfy that $\bar{Q}(S + LF) + (S + LF)^T\bar{Q} = -I$. The time derivative of V_3 along (5) can be obtained as

$$\dot{V}_2 = \bar{\xi}^T(I_M \otimes \bar{Q})\dot{\bar{\xi}} = -\|\bar{\xi}\|^2. \tag{17}$$

Consider the following Lyapunov function candidate:

$$V = V_1 + h_2 V_2,$$

where $h_2 \geq \frac{6}{\hat{\lambda}_0}\|G\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes LF\|^2$. Since $d_i(t) \geq 1$ for any $t > 0$ and $\rho_i(\cdot)$ are monotonically increasing functions satisfying $\rho_i(s) \geq 1$ for $s > 0$, it is not difficult to see that V is positive definite with respect to $\bar{\xi}$, ζ_i, and $\tilde{d}_i$, $i = M+1, \cdots, N$. By using (15) and (17), we can get the time derivative of V as

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V}_1 &\leq -\frac{1}{2}\zeta^T[\widehat{D}\hat{\rho}G \otimes I]\zeta \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{2}\min\, q_i\|\zeta\|^2 \leq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

From (18), we can get that each d_i is bounded, which, by noting $\dot{d}_i \geq 0$, implies that each d_i converges to some finite value. Note that $\dot{V}_1 \equiv 0$ is equivalent to $\zeta \equiv 0$. By LaSalle's Invariance principle [31], it follows that ζ asymptotically converges to zero. That is, $\lim_{t\to\infty}(\xi_i(t) - v(t)) = 0$, $i = M+1, \cdots, N$. ■

Remark 3: Theorem 1 shows that the local observer (6) and the distributed adaptive observer (4) ensure that the subsystems can asymptotically estimate the exogenous signal for general directed graphs satisfying Assumption 1. Because (S, I) is controllable, the ARE (7) has a unique solution $P > 0$. That is, the adaptive observer (6) always exists.

Upon the basis of the estimates ξ_i of the exogenous signal v, we propose the following controller to each subsystem as

$$u_i = K_{1i}x_i + K_{2i}\xi_i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N, \tag{19}$$

where $K_{1i} \in \mathbf{R}^{m_i \times n_i}$ and $K_{2i} \in \mathbf{R}^{m_i \times q}$ are the feedback gain matrices.

By substituting (19) into (1), we write the closed-loop dynamics of the subsystems as

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_i &= (A_i + B_i K_{1i})x_i + E_i v + B_i K_{2i}\xi_i, \\
e_i &= C_i x_i + D_i v, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Theorem 2: Suppose that Assumptions 1–5 hold. Select K_{1i} such that $A_i + B_i K_{1i}$ are Hurwitz, and $K_{2i} = U_i - K_{1i}X_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, N$, where (X_i, U_i) are solutions to the regulator equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
X_i S &= A_i X_i + B_i U_i + E_i, \\
0 &= C_i X_i + D_i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N.
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Then, the cooperative output regulation problem is solved by the distributed controller (19) and the adaptive observers (4) and (6) constructed by Theorem 1.

Proof: The closed-loop dynamics of each subsystem can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_i &= (A_i + B_i K_{1i})x_i + (E_i + B_i K_{2i})v + B_i K_{2i}\bar{\xi}_i, \\
e_i &= C_i x_i + D_i v, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N,
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where $\bar{\xi}_i = \xi_i - v$ denote the estimation errors. Since $A_i + B_i K_{1i}$ are Hurwitz and $\lim_{t\to\infty}(\xi_i(t) - v(t)) = 0$, $i = 1, \cdots, N$, it is easy to see that x_i, $i = 1, \cdots, N$, asymptotically converge to zero in the case of $v = 0$.

Let $\tilde{x}_i = x_i - X_i v$, $i = 1, \cdots, N$. Then, by invoking (21), we can obtain from (22) and (2) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\tilde{x}}_i &= (A_i + B_i K_{1i})\tilde{x}_i + B_i K_{2i}\bar{\xi}_i, \\
e_i &= C_i \tilde{x}_i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N.
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Let

$$V_3 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{x}_i^T Q_i \tilde{x}_i,$$

where $Q_i > 0$ satisfy that $Q_i(A_i + B_i K_{1i}) + (A_i + B_i K_{1i})^T Q_i = -2I$. The time derivative of V_3 along (23) can be obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V}_3 &= -4\sum_{i=1}^{N}\|\tilde{x}_i\|^2 + 2\sum_{i=1}^{N}\tilde{x}_i^T Q_i B_i K_{2i}\bar{\xi}_i \\
&\leq -3\|\tilde{x}\|^2 + \max_{i=1,\cdots,N}\|Q_i B_i K_{2i}\|^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N}\|\bar{\xi}_i\|^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where $\tilde{x} = [\tilde{x}_1^T, \cdots, \tilde{x}_N^T]^T$. From (8), we can obtain that

$$\sum_{i=M+1}^{N} \|\bar{\xi}_i\|^2 \leq 2\|\mathcal{L}_1^{-1} \otimes I\|^2 \|\zeta\|^2 + 2\|\mathcal{L}_1^{-1}\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes I\|^2 \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|\bar{\xi}_i\|^2. \tag{25}$$

Substituting (25) into (24) yields

$$\dot{V}_3 \leq -3\|\tilde{x}\|^2 + \epsilon_1\|\zeta\|^2 + \epsilon_2 \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|\bar{\xi}_i\|^2, \tag{26}$$

where

$$\epsilon_1 = 2 \max_{i=1,\cdots,N} \|Q_i B_i K_{2i}\|^2 \|\mathcal{L}_1^{-1} \otimes I\|^2,$$
$$\epsilon_2 = \max_{i=1,\cdots,N} \|Q_i B_i K_{2i}\|^2 + 2\|\mathcal{L}_1^{-1}\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes I\|^2.$$

Consider the following Lyapunov function candidate:

$$\widetilde{V} = \tilde{h}_1 V_1 + \tilde{h}_2 V_2 + V_3,$$

where V_1 and V_2 are defined as in (10) and (16), $\tilde{h}_1 = \frac{2\epsilon_1}{\min\ q_i}$, $\tilde{h}_2 = \frac{6\tilde{h}_1}{\lambda_0}\|G\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes LF\|^2 + \epsilon_2$. By using (18), (26), and (17), we can get the time derivative of V as

$$\dot{\widetilde{V}} \leq -3\|\tilde{x}\|^2.$$

By LaSalle's Invariance principle [31], it follows that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \tilde{x}(t) = 0$, which, in light of the second equation in (23), implies that $\lim_{t\to\infty} e_i(t) = 0$, $i = +1, \cdots, N$. That is, the cooperative output regulation problem is solved. ■

Remark 4: According to Theorem 1.9 in [29], each regulator equation in (21) has a unique solution (X_i, U_i) if and only if Assumption 5 holds.

Remark 5: Theorem 2 states that the proposed adaptive control scheme consisting of the controller (19) and the observers (6) and (4) can solve the cooperative output regulation problem. Note that the design of the proposed control scheme relies on the subsystem dynamics and the local information of neighboring subsystems, independent of any global information of the communication graph. Therefore, the proposed control scheme in this section is fully distributed. By comparison, the controllers in the previous work [10] require some nonzero eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix which is global information of the communication graph. The adaptive controllers in [11] are indeed fully distributed, which, however, are applicable to only undirected graphs. The proposed control scheme in this section works for general directed graphs, whose design is more challenging.

III. Robust Cooperative Output Regulation of Linear Uncertain Multi-Agent Systems

A. Problem Formulation

In this section, we consider the case where the subsystems in (1) are subject to uncertainties and have the same dimensions that are chosen to be $x_i \in \mathbf{R}^n$, $u_i \in \mathbf{R}^m$, and $e_i \in \mathbf{R}^p$. Specifically, the matrices in (1) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} &A_i = \bar{A}_i + \Delta A_i,\ B_i = \bar{B}_i + \Delta B_i,\ E_i = \bar{E}_i + \Delta E_i \\ &C_i = \bar{C}_i + \Delta C_i,\ D_i = \bar{D}_i + \Delta D_i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N, \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where $\bar{A}_i$, $\bar{B}_i$, $\bar{E}_i$, $\bar{C}_i$, $\bar{D}_i$ denote the nominal parts of these matrices, and ΔA_i, ΔB_i, ΔE_i, ΔC_i, ΔD_i are the uncertainties associated with these matrices. For convenience, let $\hat{\Delta}$ represents the uncertainty vector, defined by $\hat{\Delta} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{vec}(\Delta A_1, \cdots, \Delta A_N) \\ \mathrm{vec}(\Delta B_1, \cdots, \Delta B_N) \\ \mathrm{vec}(\Delta E_1, \cdots, \Delta E_N) \\ \mathrm{vec}(\Delta C_1, \cdots, \Delta C_N) \\ \mathrm{vec}(\Delta D_1, \cdots, \Delta D_N) \end{bmatrix}$, where $\mathrm{vec}(X)$ is a column vector formed by all the columns of matrix X.

The communication graph $\mathcal{G}$ among the N uncertain subsystems is directed and satisfies Assumption 1. The exosystem is described by (2). For the uncertain subsystems described by (1) and (27) and the exosystem (2), the robust cooperative output regulation problem in this section is to design appropriate distributed controllers based on the local information such that (i) The overall nominal closed-loop system with $\hat{\Delta} = 0$ is asymptotically stable when $v = 0$; (ii) there exists an open neighborhood W of the origin, for any $\hat{\Delta} \in W$ and any initial condition $x_i(0)$, $i = 1, \cdots, N$, and $v(0)$, $\lim_{t\to\infty} e_i(t) = 0$.

B. Distributed Adaptive State Controller

The internal model principle will be utilized to solve the robust cooperative output regulation problem. The concept of the p-copy internal model is introduced as follows [32], [29].

Definition 1: A pair of matrices (G_1, G_2) is said to incorporate the p-copy internal model of the matrix S if

$$G_1 = \mathrm{diag}(\underbrace{\beta, \cdots, \beta}_{p-tuple}), \quad G_2 = \mathrm{diag}(\underbrace{\sigma, \cdots, \sigma}_{p-tuple}), \tag{28}$$

where β is a square matrix and σ is a column vector such that (β, σ) is controllable and the minimal polynomial of β equals the characteristic polynomial of S.

Using the estimates ξ_i of the exogenous signal v via the observers (6) and (4) and the above p-copy internal model, we introduce the following distributed dynamic state feedback control law:

$$\begin{aligned} &u_i = K_{xi}x_i + K_{zi}z_i, \\ &\dot{z}_i = G_1 z_i + G_2(C_i x_i + D_i \xi_i), \quad i = 1, \cdots, N, \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where $z_i \in \mathbf{R}^{n_z}$ with n_z to be specified later, and K_{xi} and K_{zi} are the feedback gain matrices to be designed.

By combining (29) and (1), we get the augumented closed-loop dynamics of the subsystems as

$$\begin{aligned} &\dot{\eta}_i = A_{ci}\eta_i + B_{ci}v + Y_{ci}\bar{\xi}_i, \\ &e_i = C_{ci}\eta_i + D_i v, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N, \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where $\eta_i = [x_i^T, z_i^T]^T$, the estimation errors $\bar{\xi}_i$ are defined as (22), and

$$A_{ci} = \begin{bmatrix} A_i + B_i K_{xi} & B_i K_{zi} \\ G_2 C_i & G_1 \end{bmatrix},\ B_{ci} = \begin{bmatrix} E_i \\ G_2 D_i \end{bmatrix},$$
$$C_{ci} = \begin{bmatrix} C_i & 0 \end{bmatrix},\ Y_{ci} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ G_2 D_i \end{bmatrix}.$$

Theorem 3: Suppose that Assumptions 1–5 hold. Choose K_{xi} and K_{zi} such that $\begin{bmatrix} \bar{A}_i + \bar{B}_i K_{xi} & \bar{B}_i K_{zi} \\ G_2 \bar{C}_i & G_1 \end{bmatrix}$ are Hurwitz, $i = 1, \cdots, N$, Then, the robust cooperative output regulation problem is solved by the distributed controller (29) and the adaptive observers (4) and (6) constructed by Theorem 1.

Proof: Since the nominal forms of the system matrices A_{ci} of (30), equal to $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} \bar{A}_i+\bar{B}_iK_{xi} & \bar{B}_iK_{zi} \\ G_2\bar{C}_i & G_1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$, are Hurwitz, there exists an open neighborhood W such that for any $\hat{\Delta} \in W$, the state matrices A_{ci} are also Hurwitz. Because (G_1, G_2) incorporates a p-copy internal model of S, it follows from Lemma 1.27 of [29] that for any $\hat{\Delta} \in W$, there exist X_{xi} and X_{zi} such that

$$\begin{aligned} X_{xi}S &= (A_i + B_iK_{xi})X_{xi} + B_iK_{zi}X_{zi} + E_i, \\ X_{zi}S &= G_1X_{zi} + G_2(C_iX_{xi} + D_i), \\ 0 &= C_iX_{xi} + D_i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Let $X_{ci} = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} X_{xi} \\ X_{zi} \end{smallmatrix}\right]$. Then, (31) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} X_{ci}S &= A_{ci}X_{ci} + B_{ci}, \\ 0 &= C_{ci}X_{ci} + D_i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Let $\tilde{\eta}_i = \eta_i - X_{ci}v$, $i = 1, \cdots, N$. Then, we can obtain from (30), (32), and (2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{\eta}}_i &= A_{ci}\tilde{\eta}_i + Y_{ci}\bar{\xi}_i, \\ e_i &= C_{ci}\tilde{x}_i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

From (33), we see that $\lim_{t\to\infty} e_i(t) = 0$ if $\lim_{t\to\infty} \tilde{\eta}_i(t) = 0$, the latter of which can be shown by following similar steps in the proof of Theorem 2. ■

Remark 6: By choosing (G_1, G_2) which incorporates a p-copy internal model of S in the specific form as in Remark 1.23 of [29], G_1 has the property that $\operatorname{rank}\left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix} \bar{A}_i-\lambda I & \bar{B}_i \\ \bar{C}_i & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]\right) = n + p$, for all $\lambda \in \sigma(G_1)$. By Lemma 1.26 in [29], under Assumption 2 and 5, the pairs $\left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix} \bar{A}_i & 0 \\ G_2\bar{C}_i & G_1 \end{smallmatrix}\right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \bar{B}_i \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]\right)$ is stabilizable. Therefore, K_{xi} and K_{zi} do exist such that $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} \bar{A}_i+\bar{B}_iK_{xi} & \bar{B}_iK_{zi} \\ G_2\bar{C}_i & G_1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ are Hurwitz.

Remark 7: The robust cooperative output regulation problem is also studied in the previous works [15], [14], [13]. Note that those controllers in [15], [14], [13] depend on global information of the communication graph and thereby are not fully distributed. By comparison, one favorable feature of the proposed adaptive control scheme in this section is that by using the adaptive observer (6) to estimate the exogenous signal v, it is fully distributed.

C. Distributed Adaptive Output Controller for Undirected Graphs

It is worth noting that in the adaptive observer (6), each subsystem needs to transmit its own estimate ξ_i of v to its neighbors. However, it is more desirable to transmit a part of the estimates ξ_i or the outputs of ξ_i between neighboring subsystems, which reduces the communication burden. In this subsection, we will present a novel adaptive observer based on the outputs of ξ_i of neighboring subsystems, for the special case where the communication graph satisfies the following assumption:

Assumption 6: The communication graph $\mathcal{G}$ satisfies Assumption 1 and the subgraph of the uninformed subsystems is undirected.

The novel adaptive observer of each uninformed subsystem is described by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\xi}_i &= S\xi_i + c_iJ\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij}(\mu_i - \mu_j), \\ \mu_i &= F\xi_i, \\ \dot{c}_i &= \tau_i[\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij}(\mu_i - \mu_j)]^T[\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij}(\mu_i - \mu_j)], \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where $\xi_i \in \mathbf{R}^p$, $i = M+1, \cdots, N$, denotes the estimate of v on the i-th uninformed subsystem, ξ_i, $i = 1, \cdots, M$, are given by (4), $c_i(t)$ denotes the coupling gain associated with the i-th uninformed subsystem with $c_i(0) \geq 0$, τ_i are positive scalars, $J \in \mathbf{R}^{p\times l}$ is the feedback gain matrix to be determined. Note that the term $\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij}(\mu_i - \mu_j)$ in (34) implies that the subsystems need to transmit the virtual outputs μ_i of their estimates ξ_i to their neighbors via the communication network $\mathcal{G}$.

Theorem 4: Suppose that Assumptions 6 and 4 hold. Then, the estimation errors $\bar{\xi}_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, N$, defined in (22) asymptotically converge to zero, if L in (4) is chosen such that $L = J$ and the parameter in the adaptive observer (34) is chosen to be $J = \tilde{P}F^T$, where $\tilde{P} > 0$ is a solution to the following ARE:

$$\tilde{P}S^T + S\tilde{P} + I - \tilde{P}F^TF\tilde{P} = 0. \tag{35}$$

Proof: Note that $S + LF$ with $L + J$ is Hurwitz, which follows readily from (35). The convergence of the estimation errors $\bar{\xi}_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, M$, to zero is obvious. In the following, we will show the convergence of the rest estimation errors.

Under Assumption 6, it is known that all the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}_1$ are positive, each entry of $-\mathcal{L}_1^{-1}\mathcal{L}_2$ is nonnegative, and each row of $-\mathcal{L}_1^{-1}\mathcal{L}_2$ has a sum equal to one [25]. Let

$$\varrho = \begin{bmatrix} \varrho_{M+1} \\ \vdots \\ \varrho_N \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_{M+1} \\ \vdots \\ \xi_N \end{bmatrix} - (\mathcal{L}_1^{-1}\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes I) \begin{bmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \xi_M \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \bar{\xi}_i(t) = 0$, $i = M+1, \cdots, N$, if $\lim_{t\to\infty} \varrho(t) = 0$. The system (34) can be rewritten in terms of ϱ as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\varrho} &= (I_{N-M} \otimes S + \widehat{C}\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes JF)\varrho + (\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes LF)\bar{\xi}, \\ \dot{c}_i &= \tau_i[\sum_{j=M+1}^{N} \mathcal{L}_{ij}F\varrho_i]^T[\sum_{j=M+1}^{N} \mathcal{L}_{ij}F\varrho_i], \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where $\widehat{C} = \operatorname{diag}(c_{M+1}, \cdots, c_N)$, $\bar{\xi}$ is defined as in (9), and $\mathcal{L}_{ij}$ denotes the (i, j)-th entry of the Laplacian matrix $\mathcal{L}$.

Consider the Lyapunov function candidate:

$$V_4 = \frac{1}{2}\varrho^T(\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes \tilde{P}^{-1})\varrho + \sum_{i=M+1}^{N} \frac{(c_i - \alpha)^2}{2\tau_i} + \beta V_2, \tag{37}$$

where α is a positive constant and V_2 is defined as in (16). The time derivative of V_4 along the trajectory of (38) can be

obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V}_4 = {} & \varrho^T(\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes \tilde{P}^{-1}S + \mathcal{L}_1\widehat{C}\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes F^TF)\varrho \\ & + \sum_{i=M+1}^{N}(c_i-\alpha)[\sum_{j=M+1}^{N}\mathcal{L}_{ij}\varrho_i]^TF^TF[\sum_{j=M+1}^{N}\mathcal{L}_{ij}\varrho_i] \\ & + \varrho^T(\mathcal{L}_1\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes F^TF)\bar{\xi} + \beta\dot{V}_2.\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\varrho^T(\mathcal{L}_1\widehat{C}\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes F^TF)\varrho \\ &\quad = \sum_{i=M+1}^{N} c_i[\sum_{j=M+1}^{N}\mathcal{L}_{ij}\varrho_i]^TF^TF[\sum_{j=M+1}^{N}\mathcal{L}_{ij}\varrho_i],\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

and

$$\varrho^T(\mathcal{L}_1\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes F^TF)\bar{\xi} \le \frac{1}{2}\|(\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes F)\varrho\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes F\|^2\|\bar{\xi}\|^2. \tag{40}$$

Let $\beta = \frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes F\|^2$. Substituting (39), (40), and (17) into (38) yields

$$\dot{V}_4 = \frac{1}{2}\varrho^T[\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes (\tilde{P}^{-1}S + S^T\tilde{P}^{-1}) - (2\alpha+1)\mathcal{L}_1^2 \otimes F^TF)\varrho. \tag{41}$$

Since (35) holds and $\mathcal{L}_1 > 0$, we can choose α to be sufficiently large such that $\mathcal{L}_1 \otimes (\tilde{P}^{-1}S + S^T\tilde{P}^{-1}) - (2\alpha+1)\mathcal{L}_1^2 \otimes F^TF < 0$. Therefore, we get from (41) that $\dot{V}_4 \le 0$. By using LaSalle's Invariance principle [31], it follows that $\lim_{t\to\infty}\varrho(t) = 0$, which implies that $\lim_{t\to\infty}\bar{\xi}_i(t) = 0$, $i = M+1, \cdots, N$. ■

By using the observers (4) and (34), we propose the following distributed dynamic output feedback control law to each subsystem as

$$\begin{aligned}u_i &= K_iz_i, \\ \dot{z}_i &= \mathcal{P}_{1i}z_i + \mathcal{P}_{2i}(C_ix_i + D_i\xi_i), \quad i = 1, \cdots, N,\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where $K_i = [K_{xi}\ K_{zi}]$, $\mathcal{P}_{1i} = \begin{bmatrix}\bar{A}_i+\bar{B}_iK_{xi}-L_i\bar{C}_i & \bar{B}_iK_{zi} \\ 0 & G_1\end{bmatrix}$, $\mathcal{P}_{2i} = \begin{bmatrix}L_i \\ G_2\end{bmatrix}$, K_{xi} K_{zi}, G_1, and G_2 are defined as in (29), and L_i needs to be determined. By substituting (42) into (1), we get the augumented closed-loop dynamics of the subsystems as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\eta}_i &= \tilde{A}_{ci}\eta_i + \tilde{B}_{ci}v + \tilde{Y}_{ci}\bar{\xi}_i, \\ e_i &= \tilde{C}_{ci}\eta_i + D_iv, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N,\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where

$$\tilde{A}_{ci} = \begin{bmatrix}A_i & B_iK_i \\ \mathcal{P}_{2i}C_i & G_1\end{bmatrix},\ \tilde{B}_{ci} = \begin{bmatrix}E_i \\ \mathcal{P}_{2i}D_i\end{bmatrix},$$
$$\tilde{C}_{ci} = \begin{bmatrix}C_i & 0\end{bmatrix},\ \tilde{Y}_{ci} = \begin{bmatrix}0 \\ \mathcal{P}_{2i}D_i\end{bmatrix}.$$

Theorem 5: Suppose that Assumptions 1–5 hold and that $(\bar{A}_i, \bar{C}_i)$ is observable. Choose K_{xi} and K_{zi} as in Theorem 3 and L_i such that $\bar{A}_i - L_i\bar{C}_i$ are Hurwitz. Then, the robust cooperative output regulation problem is solved by the output feedback control law (42) and the adaptive observers (4) and (34) constructed by Theorem 4.

Proof: The nominal forms of the system matrices $\tilde{A}_{ci}$ are equal to $\begin{bmatrix}\bar{A}_i & \bar{B}_iK_{xi} & \bar{B}_iK_{zi} \\ L_i\bar{C}_i & \bar{A}_i+\bar{B}_iK_{xi}-L_i\bar{C}_i & \bar{B}_iK_{zi} \\ G_2\bar{C}_i & 0 & G_1\end{bmatrix}$. Multiplying the left hand side of the above matrix by $T = \begin{bmatrix}I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \\ -I & I & 0\end{bmatrix}$ and the right hand side by T^{-1} gives $\begin{bmatrix}\bar{A}_i+\bar{B}_iK_{xi} & \bar{B}_iK_{zi} & \bar{B}_iK_{xi} \\ G_2\bar{C}_i & G_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \bar{A}_i-L_i\bar{C}_i\end{bmatrix}$. Therefore, it is easy to see that the nominal forms of $\tilde{A}_{ci}$ are Hurwitz, implying that there exists an open neighborhood W such that for any $\hat{\Delta} \in W$, the state matrices $\tilde{A}_{ci}$ are also Hurwitz. The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 3. ■

Remark 8: Compared to the state feedback adaptive controllers in [11], The proposed control scheme in this section is based on the local output information, which requires less communication burden.

IV. Numerical Simulation

In this section, a simulation example will be presented for illustration.

The dynamics of the subsystems are described by (1), with

$$\begin{aligned}&A_i = \begin{bmatrix}0 & 1 \\ \delta_{i1} & \delta_{i2}\end{bmatrix},\ B_i = \begin{bmatrix}0 \\ 2\end{bmatrix},\ E_i = \begin{bmatrix}\varsigma_i & 0 \\ 0 & 1\end{bmatrix}, \\ &C_i = \begin{bmatrix}1 & 0\end{bmatrix},\ D_i = \begin{bmatrix}0 & 2\end{bmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

where ς_i are randomly chosen within the interval $[1, 3]$ and $\Delta A_i = \begin{bmatrix}0 & 0 \\ \delta_{i1} & \delta_{i2}\end{bmatrix}$, with δ_{i1} and δ_{i2} randomly chosen within $(0, 0.06]$, denotes the uncertainty associated with A_i. The exosystem is described by (2), with $S = \begin{bmatrix}0 & 1 \\ -2 & 0\end{bmatrix}$ and $F = -D_i$. It is easy to verify that Assumptions 2–5 are satisfied. The information flow among all subsystems and the exosystem is depicted as the directed graph in Fig. 1, where the node indexed by 0 denotes the exosystem, the node indexed by 1 is the informed follower and the rest are the uninformed followers. Clearly, Assumption 1 holds.



Fig. 1: The information flow among all subsystems and the exosystem.

To solve the robust cooperative output regulation problem, we will implement the observers (6) and (4) and the control law (29). As shown in Theorem 1, choose $L = \begin{bmatrix}0 \\ 1.5\end{bmatrix}$ such that $S + LF$ is Hurwitz. Solving the ARE (7) gives $P = \begin{bmatrix}1.2739 & -0.1623 \\ -0.1623 & 0.8057\end{bmatrix}$, implying that Γ in (6) equals $\begin{bmatrix}1.6491 & -0.3375 \\ -0.3375 & 0.6754\end{bmatrix}$. Following Remark 1.23 in [29], let $G_1 = \begin{bmatrix}0 & 1 \\ -2 & 0\end{bmatrix}$ and $G_2 = \begin{bmatrix}0 \\ 1\end{bmatrix}$. Using Theorem 2, select K_{xi} and K_{zi} in (29) to be $K_{xi} = -\begin{bmatrix}4.95 & 2.85\end{bmatrix}$ and $K_{zi} = \begin{bmatrix}8.1 & 0.3\end{bmatrix}$. The simulation result is shown in Fig. 2, from which we can observe that all regulated outputs e_i of the subsystems asymptotically converge to zero.



Fig. 2: The regulated outputs e_i of the subsystems.

V. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented several distributed adaptive observer-based controllers to solve the cooperative output regulation problem for multi-agent systems with nominal or certain linear subsystems and a linear exosystem. A distinct feature of the proposed adaptive controllers is that they can be designed and implemented by each subsystem in a fully distributed manner for general directed graphs. This is the main contribution of this paper with respect to the existing related works. A future research direction is to extend the idea in this paper to nonlinear multi-agent systems.

References

[1] W. Ren, R. Beard, and E. Atkins, "Information consensus in multivehicle cooperative control," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 71–82, 2007.

[2] Y. Cao, W. Yu, W. Ren, and G. Chen, "An overview of recent progress in the study of distributed multi-agent coordination," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 427–438, 2013.

[3] Z. Li and Z. Duan, *Cooperative Control of Multi-Agent Systems: A Consensus Region Approach*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2014.

[4] H. Su, M. Chen, X. Wang, and J. Lam, "Semiglobal observer-based leader-following consensus with input saturation," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 61, pp. 2842–2850, 2014.

[5] J. Qin, C. Yu, and H. Gao, "Coordination for linear multiagent systems with dynamic interaction topology in the leader-following framework," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 61, pp. 2412–2422, 2014.

[6] H. Zhang, F. Lewis, and Z. Qu, "Lyapunov, adaptive, and optimal design techniques for cooperative systems on directed communication graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 59, pp. 3026–3041, 2012.

[7] H. Zhang, G. Feng, H. Yan, and Q. Chen, "Observer-based output feedback event-triggered control for consensus of multi-agent systems," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 61, pp. 4885–94, 2014.

[8] W. Zeng and M.-Y. Chow, "A reputation-based secure distributed control methodology in D-NCS," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 61, pp. 6294–303, 2014.

[9] J. Xiang, W. Wei, and Y. Li, "Synchronized output regulation of linear networked systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 1336–1341, 2009.

[10] Y. Su and J. Huang, "Cooperative output regulation of linear multi-agent systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 1062–1066, 2012.

[11] S. Li, G. Feng, X. Guan, X. Luo, and J. Wang, "Distributed adaptive pinning control for cooperative linear output regulation of multi-agent systems," in *The 32nd Chinese Control Conference*, pp. 6885–6890, 2013.

[12] Z. Meng, T. Yang, D. V. Dimarogonas, and K. H. Johansson, "Coordinated output regulation of multiple heterogeneous linear systems," in *The 52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 2175–2180, 2013.

[13] Y. Su, Y. Hong, and J. Huang, "A general result on the robust cooperative output regulation for linear uncertain multi-agent systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 1275–1279, 2013.

[14] L. Yu and J. Wang, "Robust cooperative control for multi-agent systems via distributed output regulation," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 62, no. 11, pp. 1049–1056, 2013.

[15] X. Wang, Y. Hong, J. Huang, and Z.-P. Jiang, "A distributed control approach to a robust output regulation problem for multi-agent linear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 2891–2895, 2010.

[16] C. De Persis and B. Jayawardhana, "On the internal model principle in the coordination of nonlinear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 272–282, 2014.

[17] A. Isidori, L. Marconi, and G. Casadei, "Robust output synchronization of a network of heterogeneous nonlinear agents via nonlinear regulation theory," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 2680–2691, 2014.

[18] Z. Ding, "Consensus output regulation of a class of heterogeneous nonlinear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 10, pp. 2648–2653, 2013.

[19] Z. Ding, "Adaptive consensus output regulation of a class of nonlinear systems with unknown high-frequency gain," *Automatica*, vol. 51, pp. 348–355, 2015.

[20] Z. Li, W. Ren, X. Liu, and L. Xie, "Distributed consensus of linear multi-agent systems with adaptive dynamic protocols," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 7, pp. 1986–1995, 2013.

[21] Z. Li, W. Ren, X. Liu, and M. Fu, "Consensus of multi-agent systems with general linear and Lipschitz nonlinear dynamics using distributed adaptive protocols," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 1786–1791, 2013.

[22] W. Yu, W. Ren, W. X. Zheng, G. Chen, and J. Lü, "Distributed control gains design for consensus in multi-agent systems with second-order nonlinear dynamics," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 7, pp. 2107–2115, 2013.

[23] Z. Li, G. Wen, Z. Duan, and W. Ren, "Designing fully distributed consensus protocols for linear multi-agent systems with directed graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, in press, 2014.

[24] Y. Hong, X. Wang, and Z.-P. Jiang, "Distributed output regulation of leader–follower multi-agent systems," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 48–66, 2013.

[25] Y. Cao, W. Ren, and M. Egerstedt, "Distributed containment control with multiple stationary or dynamic leaders in fixed and switching directed networks," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 1586–1597, 2012.

[26] Z. Qu, *Cooperative Control of Dynamical Systems: Applications to Autonomous Vehicles*. London, UK: Springer-Verlag, 2009.

[27] P. Wieland, R. Sepulchre, and F. Allgöwer, "An internal model principle is necessary and sufficient for linear output synchronization," *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 1068–1074, 2011.

[28] T. Yang, A. Saberi, A. A. Stoorvogel, and H. F. Grip, "Output synchronization for heterogeneous networks of introspective right-invertible agents," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 24, no. 13, pp. 1821–1844, 2014.

[29] J. Huang, *Nonlinear Output Regulation: Theory and Applications*. SIAM, 2004.

[30] D. S. Bernstein, *Matrix Mathematics: Theory, Facts, and Formulas*. Princeton University Press, 2009.

[31] H. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002.

[32] E. J. Davison, "The robust control of a servomechanism problem for linear time-invariant multivariable systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 25–34, 1976.